

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 and 12-18 are all the claims pending in the application.

### **I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yanagihara et al. (U.S. 6,127,989).

Claim 8, as amended, recites the features of a formatter operable to add a predetermined number of pseudo data to the rear of a code sequence indicating the end of the coded data so that the data bus width of pipeline transfer including the end of the coded data becomes equal to the bus width of pipeline transfer including other data, wherein the predetermined number is always less than the data bus width of pipeline transfer, and wherein the coded data is transferred successively in a pipeline manner. Applicants submit that the Yanagihara fails to disclose or suggest at least these features of claim 8.

As explained in Yanagihara, communication of MPEG-PS data is not normally performed by using a digital interface in accordance with IEEE 1394 (see col. 1 lines 17-19 and col. 2, lines 51-55). In order to transmit such data in accordance with IEEE 1394, Yanagihara discloses that a pack forming a unit of MPEG-PS data (which has a length of 2,048 bytes) can be converted into packets that are transmitted in accordance with IEEE 1394 (see col. 3, lines 5-12).

In order to convert the MPEG-PS data into a packet that is transmitted in accordance with the IEEE 1394 standard, padding data is added. For example, in the Abstract of Yanagihara and in col. 7, lines 1-7, it is disclosed that Yanagihara is able to add padding data to a 2,048 byte pack of MPEG-PS data so that the overall byte length of data is a multiple of 16. Thus, in Yanagihara

the padding data is added so that data packets can be divided into data blocks having a size (e.g., 36 byte data blocks as shown in Fig. 16(E)) that is necessary to convert the MPEG-PS data pack into packets that conform with IEEE 1394.

As noted above, claim 8 now recites that the predetermined number of pseudo data which is added to the rear of the code sequence is always less than the data bus width of pipeline transfer.

In contrast, Applicants note that in Fig. 4 of Yanagihara, it is clearly shown that depending on the number of divisions, padding data which is larger than one of the division units is added to the end of the pack of MPEG-PS data.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that while Yanagihara discloses the ability to add padding data so that data packets can be divided into data blocks having a size that is necessary to convert the MPEG-PS data pack into packets that conform with IEEE 1394, that Yanagihara does not disclose or suggest that a predetermined number of pseudo data which is added to the rear of a code sequence is always less than the data bus width of pipeline transfer, as recited in amended claim 8.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Yanagihara does not disclose, suggest or otherwise render obvious all of the features recited in claim 8. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 8 is patentable over Yanagihara, an indication of which is kindly requested.

Claims 9 and 18 depend from claim 8 are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. (U.S. 5,568,274) in view of Yanagihara et al. (U.S. 6,127,989).

Initially, Applicants note that the Examiner indicated in the Office Action that the above-noted rejection is under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants presume that this is merely a typographical error, and that the Examiner intended to reject the claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1, as amended, recites the features of a data formatter operable to output predetermined data in accordance with matching status information when a sequence of input code is judged not to be a part of a packet start code, and not to output when the sequence of input code is judged to be part of the packet start code; and a head code detection unit operable to receive the sequence of input code in units of a predetermined bit length, and to determine whether a current input code of the sequence of input code matches a current code of the packet start code, wherein the data formatter is operable to output the predetermined data at a timing when the head code detection unit determines that the current input code of the sequence of input code does not match the current code of the packet start code. Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami and Yanagihara do not teach or suggest such a combination of features.

Regarding Fujinami, Applicants note that this reference discloses an apparatus for recording multiplexed audio and video signals, wherein the apparatus includes a header separation circuit 22, a switching circuit 23, and a control circuit 24 (see Figs. 2 and 12). The header separation circuit 22 separates pack headers and packet headers from a multiplexed signal,

supplies the separated headers to the control circuit 24, and supplies the multiplexed signal to an input terminal G of the switching circuit 23 (see col. 3, lines 9-15).

In Fujinami, the control circuit 24 causes the switching circuit 23 to connect the input terminal G successively to the output terminals H1 and H2 in accordance with a stream ID of the packet header received from the header separation circuit 22 (see col. 3, lines 17-22 and col. 15, lines 29-33). By operating the switching circuit 23 of Fujinami in this manner, the video data and the audio data can be separated from one another, wherein the video data is supplied to the video decoder 25 and the audio data is supplied to the audio decoder 26 (see Figs. 2 and 12; and col. 3, lines 22-25).

Therefore, as is evident from the above-noted description, in Fujinami, packet headers are separated from a multiplexed signal and provided to a control circuit, wherein the control circuit controls the switching circuit to connect to either output terminal H1 or output terminal H2 based on whether the data is audio data or video data.

Thus, while Fujinami disclose the ability to separate a packet header and control switching based on the analysis of the header, Applicants respectfully submit that Fujinami does not disclose or in any way suggest the features of a data formatter that is operable to output predetermined data in accordance with matching status information when a sequence of input code is judged not to be a part of a packet start code, and not to output when the sequence of input code is judged to be part of the packet start code; and a head code detection unit operable to receive the sequence of input code in units of a predetermined bit length, and to determine whether a current input code of the sequence of input code matches a current code of the packet

start code, wherein the data formatter is operable to output the predetermined data at a timing when the head code detection unit determines that the current input code of the sequence of input code does not match the current code of the packet start code, as recited in amended claim 1.

Further, regarding Yanagihara, Applicants respectfully submit that this reference does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Fujinami.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited prior art does not teach, suggest or otherwise render obvious the combination of features recited in amended claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art, an indication of which is kindly requested. Claims 2, 3 and 10-13 depend from claim 1 and are therefore considered patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

B. The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 6, 7, 14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. in view of Boden (U.S. 5,633,686).

Initially, regarding the above-noted rejection, Applicants note that because claim 1 was rejected based on a combination of Fujinami et al. and Yanagihara et al., Applicants presume that the Examiner intended to reject the above-noted claims based on a combination of Fujinami et al., Yanagihara et al., and Boden.

Claims 4, 6, 7, 14, 16 and 17 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Boden fails to cure the deficiencies of Fujinami and Yanagihara, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 4, 6, 7, 14, 16 and 17 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujinami et al. in view of Toyohara (U.S. 5,768,265).

Similar to the discussion above, regarding the above-noted rejection, Applicants note that because claim 1 was rejected based on a combination of Fujinami et al. and Yanagihara et al., Applicants presume that the Examiner intended to reject the above-noted claims based on a combination of Fujinami et al., Yanagihara et al., and Toyohara.

Claims 5 and 15 depend from claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Toyohara fails to cure the deficiencies of Fujinami and Yanagihara, as discussed above, with respect to claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 5 and 15 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.


### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may best be resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryoji YAMAGUCHI et al.

By:   
Kenneth W. Fields  
Registration No. 52,430  
Attorney for Applicants

KWF/jjv  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
April 2, 2007